

agreement, because our constituents out there want us to get there because the problems in our health care system dictate that we create a real solution that isn't incremental and isn't small and around the edges, but attacks the foundation and the gut and the root of our problems.

So I look forward to coming back down to the House floor and continuing to push forward this case for reform.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the gentleman for yielding to me earlier in the hour. I think an open dialogue is a good thing, and I hope the gentlemen will be here to hear the rebuttals that I am about to provide to the statements that they made in the previous hour, starting with the bill that passed out of the Energy and Commerce Committee and other committees, H.R. 3200, which is the foundational bill to the health care act, the national health care act that Democrats are seeking to pass.

And regardless of the statement that there is general language in the bill that says nothing in this bill funds illegals, the fact remains that the amendment that was offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL), which was language that is tried and true, that existed in the Medicaid legislation that we have used for at least a decade that requires proof of citizenship, that amendment was voted down in Energy and Commerce 29-28, resulting in an open-door policy where there are no restrictions to keep the bill from providing access to benefits to illegals or to people who are here legally but are barred under the 5-year bar.

In fact, the standard that exists was a standard that required proof of citizenship. Democrats first took that apart when they passed an expansion of SCHIP, the State Children's Health Insurance Program. They took that from a 200 percent of poverty, and the first time it passed the House it went to 400 percent of poverty. Mr. DEAL offered the same amendment in that bill to put in language that existed in law before it was struck out by the expansion of SCHIP, and it was voted down on almost a party-line effort.

We know if there are not provisions which require proof of citizenship, then there aren't provisions that are going to prohibit illegals from getting benefits under the bill. The Congressional Budget Office knows that. They scored that language in SCHIP as costing \$8.9 billion to fund health insurance for illegals and to provide Medicaid to illegals because it removed the citizenship standard. Removing the citizenship standard, according to the Congressional Budget Office, on H.R. 3200, the health care bill, would provide for

access to those benefits under the bill for as many 5.6 million illegals. And that's the score that came out from the Congressional Budget Office.

Another nonpartisan organization is the Congressional Research Services, and they also concluded there weren't restrictions in H.R. 3200, the health care bill, so that would result in those benefits going to illegals who would apply. And we know how fast the grapevine works and how effectively people can game the system, and no one should be in a position of responsibility in this Congress if they can't understand that equation, especially if they are on the committee.

And it is not just STEVE KING making this statement. It is the Congressional Budget Office on at least two different occasions, rendering a judgment on that specific language of the Deal amendment, and it is Congressional Research Services. And by the way, it goes on down the line and a number of other entities, including the President, who finally had to address it and say we are going to have to write something in the bill to protect us so it doesn't fund illegals. And it also includes the Senate, which took the position that they would address the language.

So why do you have to fix it if it doesn't fund illegals the way it is? And I believe that the President stood here and called a group of Members of Congress who were exactly right on their facts, I believe he accused them of not being honest. And directly, he said, We will call you out.

Well, I'm saying this: The President got it wrong. Maybe he has it right now, but these gentlemen have it wrong, and they need to go back and check their facts. The amendment was voted down 29-28. The Deal amendment required proof of citizenship. When you remove the proof of citizenship requirement, the Congressional Budget Office and the Congressional Research Services and every nonpartisan, objective evaluation comes to the same conclusion: We will be funding illegals if we don't have the language in there. That is the only language that is going to be satisfactory. And by the way, I don't think Senator BAUCUS has it in his bill yet, although he has pledged to do so, and we will watch that language very carefully as it unfolds over in the Senate.

So yes, illegals would get health care under this system unless we write the language in that sets the standard so that they don't.

The statement that was made by the gentleman, Mr. ALTMIRE, with the public option there would be no subsidies. The facts of the health care bill don't support that. First of all, it is going to take capital to set up the public option as a national health insurance company. If you set up a national health insurance company, it is impossible to do so without putting capital in, without injecting some billions of dollars to jump-start a national health insurance

program that would compete directly with the 1,300 private health insurance companies that we have.

That is not what you call a no-subsidy situation. That is called a subsidy situation. Putting capital in to compete against the private sector is subsidy.

What do we suppose will happen if we put \$10 billion into the front end of this national health insurance program and we find out that it becomes insolvent? Do we then let it collapse or does this Congress at a later date decide we are going to have to put some billions of dollars in there to keep the national health care plan up?

Under these majorities, under this Pelosi Congress, I guarantee you they will borrow money from the Chinese, if necessary, in order to subsidize a national health care plan. It isn't going to go any other way. They have worked for 30 or 40 years to try to establish a national health care, and they are not going to allow it to go under because it falls a little short on some kind of promise that there won't be subsidies. Yes, there will be subsidies, and any rational person who understands history will know that.

The argument that a national health care plan will compete on a level playing field, a level playing field with referees that will be chosen by the government, not by the private sector, and I will make a point.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the formerly embargoed flowchart that actually depicts the language that exists in H.R. 3200, the national health care plan. We call it the Organizational Chart of the House Democrats' Health Plan. This is the government plan. This is the government option configuration. This creates at least 31 new agencies.

Now, down here at the bottom, I just direct your attention to these two purple circles at the bottom. This is where the crux of the matter is. The gentleman, Mr. ALTMIRE, made the statement that the public option, there wouldn't be any subsidies and they would compete on a level playing field. Well, here is how this field is regulated, and it will not be a level playing field.

Oh, by the way, anything that is a white box is existing programs or agencies. There is Medicare, SCHIP, Medicaid. But the existing private insurers in this little box here, Mr. Speaker, once the bill is passed, these private insurers, this is 1,300 health insurance companies in this little box. That is how many private insurers we have. Those traditional health insurance plans, the policies, there are approximately 100,000 different varieties of policy combinations available across the United States. These policies would have to qualify to become qualified health benefits plans. Now, if there is going to be a qualification set up, I think it is not possible to presume that all 1,300 companies and all 100,000 policies will be qualified under this bill.

□ 2145

This bill doesn't define what will be required necessarily in the health insurance policies. It gives that authority to the Health Choices Administration. The Health Choices Administration commissioner would run that shop with his commission, and they would make the decisions then on what would be the standards for the health insurance companies—these providers here—what would be the standards for the 100,000 health insurance plans which would qualify to go into this purple circle here called qualified health benefits plans.

So for all of this, the rules will be set by the Health Choices Administration commissioner. The new Health Choices czar will write all of those rules. If he has to write the rules, you don't get to call it a level playing field because the rules will be written so the Federal Government can compete. That's the difference in the approach here, the idea that it is a level playing field. It's not. My question was, why are you afraid of the competition? Well, I'm not afraid of the competition. I think we have competition in our health insurance companies. I think that they're afraid of the competition or else they would support the proposal that almost every Republican supports, and that is, allow Americans to buy health insurance across State lines. That expands the competition dramatically, Mr. Speaker.

So there is a fear of competition. There is a fear of letting the free market provide that competition and giving people the portability that they need. There is a real fear also of addressing lawsuit abuse. Lawsuit abuse is the medical malpractice component of these costs that the industry places between 5.5 and 16 percent of the overall health care costs. The number that comes from the person whom I trust the most is 8.5 percent. If you multiply that 8.5 percent across the costs of providing health care in America, over the space of time, it's \$203 billion or \$2 trillion for the sake of the budget window of 10 years that we deal with. That \$2 trillion would pay for everything they wanted to do, but every one of them will stand in the way and block the lawsuit abuse that could actually fund their socialized medicine because the trial lawyers are telling them that they can't address it.

So there are a lot of things that we would like to do. We would like to provide portability, and we would like to fix the lawsuit abuse problem, and we would like to be able to buy health insurance across State lines, provide full deductibility for everybody who pays a health insurance premium, provide transparency in the billing so we can actually have some real competition out there and allow people to expand the HSAs so that HSAs can transform themselves, under good management and good health, into retirement plans, pension plans when one reaches Medicare eligibility age. Those are some of the things on health care.

Mr. Speaker, I feel compelled to rebut some of the statements that were made in the previous hour. And as much as I get along with the gentlemen that were making their presentation, I clearly disagree with a lot of their conclusions. But they have their talking points down pretty well, given what comes out of the DCCC.

I came here tonight, though, to talk about the missile defense shield and the issue with Eastern Europe. I believe the President of the United States has bargained away a very, very important shield that was essential to the negotiations that were going on with Iran. And in their persistent and relentless effort to develop a nuclear capability, not only a nuclear weapon but a means to deliver it, and if they can develop that means to deliver it along with a nuclear weapon, they have said that they want to annihilate Israel, and they eventually want to annihilate the United States. This would put them very closely within the umbrella of being able to strike many places in Europe as well. In the chess game that is going on, in the poker game that's going on, and in the Monopoly game that's going on in the United States, it is something that is very high test. It's very high risk.

We have with us tonight one of the real leaders in this issue who understands the physics, the technology, the politics, the global approach to this, Putin's involvement in this chess game, of him seeking to reconstruct the vestiges of the former Soviet Union, the dynamics of the psychology of the mullahs in Iran, the necessity for the Israelis to defend themselves, and the necessity and the constitutional responsibility for Americans to do the same. I am happy to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. TRENT FRANKS. Thank you for coming down, Mr. FRANKS.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Thank you, Mr. KING.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to express my gratitude to STEVE KING. The gentleman from Iowa is not only a precious friend, but I truly believe that he is a friend of freedom and a friend of America. All of the things that he has laid out related to the health care reform plan put forward by the majority I completely embrace. There are so many things that are important to discuss in the country today. I mean, one of the things that can be said for the Barack Obama administration is that they're moving fast in a host of different areas. I happen to disagree with the vast majority of those areas, and it makes it very difficult sometimes to pick the priority to speak to.

But let me just say, the priority that I would like to speak to tonight, with the permission of the gentleman from Iowa—and maybe we can speak to it as we go here—is this whole issue of missile defense. Mr. Speaker, last week the Obama administration did something that could go down in history as a

crossroads in European-American relations. I am afraid that this and future American generations may be gravely affected by his decision. The administration decided to abandon U.S. plans for a ground-based U.S. missile defense site in Europe, and I believe the President fundamentally disgraced this Nation by breaking his word to our loyal and courageous allies in the Czech Republic and in Poland. Mr. Speaker, for many reasons, America has become the greatest nation in the history of the world because our word has meant something. The announcement to abandon the protective missile defense shield in Europe has fundamentally altered that paradigm.

After the decision was announced, the newspaper headlines in Poland and the Czech Republic stated the situation in the very starkest of terms. One Polish newspaper had the headline, "Betrayed!"—betrayed, wow, that's heavy stuff, Mr. Speaker—"The USA has sold us to the Russians and stabbed us in the back." The Czech Republic, the daily Lidowe Noviny commented, "Obama gave in to the Kremlin."

Mr. Speaker, President Obama's decision to abandon our faithful allies and, instead, to placate Russian belligerence came on the 70th anniversary to the exact day of the Soviet Union's invasion of Poland after two of humanity's most notorious monsters named Stalin and Hitler insidiously agreed to divide the Nation of Poland between themselves. Our allies deserve better than that, Mr. Speaker. After they stood bravely in the face of Russian aggression and paid a profound political price to stand by us, they had a right to expect America to keep her word and to stand by them.

Mr. Speaker, ironically, Mr. Obama's terribly flawed decision for abandoning the European missile defense site has everything to do with primarily Russia. Russia has always hated the missile defense plan because they don't want an American presence in their former empire, knowing that this would diminish Russia's influence in the entire region, even though the European site would not threaten in any way Russia's military capability. There is no way that 10 ground-based interceptors can have any real effect on the Russian Federation nuclear strike, if they chose. Russia's leaders know that if an American radar is placed in the Czech Republic and American missile interceptors are placed in Poland, those two sovereign countries would be stepping further away from the shackles of Russian oppression in the East and joining with America in the West in the cause for democratic independence and human freedom.

But Russian belligerence notwithstanding, reports surfaced in March of this year, indicating President Obama had covertly offered Russians a promise that the United States would cease moving forward with the deployment of the ground-based missile defense site in Europe if Moscow—now this is unbelievable to me, Mr. Speaker—if Moscow

would commit to helping to discourage Iran's nuclear programs. Now let us just recall for a moment, Mr. Speaker, that it was Russia that actually delivered nuclear fuel to Iran, and Russia was paid \$800 million by Iran for its work on the Bushehr nuclear reactor, which will help Iran make their own nuclear fuel for weapons. Russia has been strongly suspected of aiding Iran's already advancing missile program itself.

Moreover, just this week, Mr. Speaker, Venezuela's Hugo Chavez announced that they were purchasing more than \$2 billion worth of arms from Russia, including rocket technology, and Mr. Chavez has already declared that Venezuela will get started on a nuclear program with Iran's help.

Mr. Speaker, asking Russia to choke off Iran's nuclear program while ceding our only defense against Iranian long-range ballistic missiles is as illogical as a police officer offering his bullet-proof vest to a gang of violent criminals in exchange for verbal assurances that they won't use their guns. Our allies, potential allies, rogue nations and terrorist groups all over the world were watching President Obama's capitulation. President Obama swore he would restore America's relationships in the world, relationships the liberal Democrats accuse the Bush administration of destroying. But instead of restoring America's relationships, he has diminished our credibility across the world and possibly beyond repair.

Most importantly, Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve to be told the truth about what we actually lost when the President abandoned the European missile defense site in Poland and the Czech Republic. Today the nation of Iran is defying the Western world in its determined pursuit of nuclear weapons, which would allow Iran and its proxies to hold the entire peace-loving world under nuclear threat. The most devastating aspect of the President's decision—of course aside from forfeiting our ability to intercept long-range ballistic missiles aimed at the American homeland—is that it removed a strong disincentive for Iran to continue with its nuclear weapons program, and that was one of the critical purposes of the European missile defense site from the very beginning, Mr. Speaker. It was meant to create a strategic disincentive for Iran to develop a nuclear long-range missile capability. Iran would have had to face the fact that they were pursuing a long-range missile technology for which we already had a defense.

In other words, it would have been like trying to spread a virus when we had already been inoculated against it. Instead, Mr. Speaker, we have forfeited that strategic advantage, and we have gained nothing in return. As timelines exist now—and this is such an important point—as timelines exist now, any alternative to the system the President abandoned will come too late to be a significant factor in preventing the na-

tion of Iran from developing a nuclear missile capability that will threaten the peace of the entire free world and its children.

Mr. Speaker, if Iran does achieve a nuclear capability, it will officially launch a nuclear arms race in the Middle East. It will allow a corrupt regime—whose leader hates America, whose leader hates Israel and the Western world, and who considers Armageddon to be a good thing—to be able to hold the United States and our allies at risk from a ballistic missile carrying a nuclear warhead, much like the Soviet Union did during the Cold War.

As former U.N. Ambassador John Bolton has stated, "There is no harm in deploying our missile defenses before ICBMs can reach America. But there is incalculable risk if Iran is ready before we are." Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, Iran may be ready far sooner than the Obama administration seems ready to admit. Recent reports state that Iran may reach a nuclear weapons capability within as little as 1 year, and The New York Times recently stated that Iran now possesses at least 7,200 centrifuges capable of producing weapons-grade enriched uranium and that they have already produced enough low enriched uranium to make at least one nuclear warhead.

Mr. Speaker, I sometimes have the hardest time just stating the facts as they are without sounding like an alarmist. But I truly believe this. And I will go on record to say that I hope that the listeners and anyone—including you, Mr. Speaker—are really paying attention. This needs to be said. If the Obama administration continues down this road of appeasement and denial, the nation of Iran will gain a nuclear capability, and they will pass that technology and those weapons on to the most dangerous terrorists in the world. And this generation and so many to come, Mr. Speaker, will face the horrifying reality of nuclear jihad.

Those of us who have been blessed to walk in the sunlight of freedom in this generation will relegate our freedom to walk in the minefield of nuclear terrorism in the next generation. Mr. Speaker, the preeminent responsibility of the President of the United States and even of this Congress is to protect the national security of the United States. I believe that President Barack Obama's abandonment of the ballistic missile defense site in Europe fundamentally betrays that responsibility.

□ 2200

I am stunned that he does not seem to understand that, and I am sincerely in fear that our children and our children's children may pay a tragic price for that betrayal.

I thank the gentleman for the time, and I will be glad to enter into any kind of colloquy or discussions. Thank you, sir.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Arizona, and I look forward to the colloquy that we will have,

and I know I've asked the gentleman from Missouri to add a broad view to this.

I just would recap the presentation that we've listened to here, which is precisely worded and is, I think, precisely accurate. It researches some conclusions that I don't think anyone who has followed this in a logical fashion can avoid:

As I understand this, we have been setting up the nuclear shield in Poland and in Czechoslovakia. It takes about 5 years to get it set up. The anticipation was that the Iranians wouldn't be ready for about 5 years. At about the time the President capitulated on this, we had a report that was leaked that maybe Iran could be ready a lot sooner, in maybe as soon as a year.

So I'll just direct your attention to The Wall Street Journal, to Mark Helprin's article. He has a unique way of observing what, I think, the gentleman from Arizona has articulated so well.

Helprin writes: What we have here is an inadvertent homage to Lewis Carroll. We're going to cancel a defense that takes 5 years to mount because the threat will not materialize for 5 years, and we will not deploy land-based interceptors in Europe because our new plan is to deploy land-based interceptors in Europe later.

Does the gentleman from Arizona care to comment on the accuracy of that statement?

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Well, I believe that Mr. Helprin is exactly correct. These things don't happen overnight. It takes a certain timeline in order to build both an offensive capability and a defensive capability. We were on track to have our defensive capability in place by around 2012, which would have probably been before Iran could have actually launched a full-blown intercontinental ballistic missile against the homeland of the United States.

As it stands now, the ostensible alternative that the President is offering will not even be in place until 2018 or until 2020, at which time the Iranians will be fully capable and will just be ignoring us at that point.

It just gives us no real opportunity to use the European missile defense site as a factor to help play in the calculus or to prevent Iran from gaining that nuclear capability. Once they do it, it's just hard to put the toothpaste back in the tube.

Mr. KING of Iowa. In the gentleman's opinion, does this capitulation on the part of President Obama make it more or less likely that the Israelis will be compelled to strike at the capabilities of Iran?

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Well, let me just say this first with the gentleman's permission: I believe, if the free world places Israel in the untenable position of having to defend itself, which it will have to do if no one else has the courage to stand up to Iran, Israel will have no choice. It has no room for error.

Ahmadinejad has said that they want to wipe Israel off the map. One warhead could virtually destroy Israel. We can put eight Israels in the size of my State of Arizona. They're only a one-bomb nation. They cannot abide an Iranian lunatic like Ahmadinejad, who has his finger on the nuclear button with a Shahab-3 that can reach Israel in about 12 to 14 minutes. They cannot possibly abide that.

We in the free world know that. If we stand by and force Israel to respond like we've done in times past, whether it be with Syria or with the nuclear power plant in Iraq sometime ago, the Orissa plant, if we put them in that position, then we really fail the whole world because that will enflame the passions of the entire Arab world; and it will, I think, set us on a path of great contention.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, as I look at this and at the strategic location of Israel and at the 12 to 14 minutes that it takes for a missile to get from Iran to Israel and at the 12 to 14 months for Iran to have the capabilities to do so, the odds of being able to slow Iran's development down of nuclear weapons because of any diplomatic maneuverings that might come with regard to sanctions—economic sanctions, negotiations, blockades, threats of anything—have diminished dramatically because the club has been laid down by President Obama; the shield has been laid down by President Obama, and it sends the message to Iran:

Accelerate your efforts on the 17 to 200 centrifuges that you have.

So, from my view, it puts Israel in a position where they may have no choice. If they wait 12 to 14 months to make their decision, the decision may be coming too late at that period of time.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Tragically, Mr. KING, the Israelis will have almost no choice. This will be a defensive action on their part because they've already been told by the Iranian leaders that they intend to wipe Israel off the map. This would give them the capacity to do just that.

I just think it's a tragedy, beyond my ability to articulate, that we don't have the understanding of what we're really facing here. I think Mr. Obama is simply naive as to the danger and as to the mindset of jihad and as to how serious they really are.

You know, they played rope-a-dope with us in North Korea for many, many years; and now we know that they plan and continue to plan to come to a full-scale nuclear weapons capability. The same thing exists with Iran.

Unfortunately, I believe only two things will stop Iran from gaining a nuclear capability: either military intervention or the conviction in Iranian leaders' minds that nuclear intervention will occur if they don't stop their march towards a nuclear weapons capability. I'm afraid that Israel understands that. If we don't respond or if

some coalition of the Western World doesn't respond, then Israel will be left with no choice.

Mr. KING of Iowa. A third alternative, I might suggest, would be if the people in Iran could successfully rise up, could take that country over and could move towards peace.

I know the gentleman from Missouri has got an opinion on this subject matter. I would be very happy to yield so much time as TODD AKIN will consume in laying out the parameters of the view of this as he sees it.

Mr. AKIN, thank you for coming to the floor tonight.

Mr. AKIN. I thank my very good friend from the State next-door to the State of Missouri. I thank him for his common sense.

I also thank my good friend from Arizona, a fellow member of the Armed Services Committee. He is both a statesman and is very good from an engineering point of view with the details of what is going on.

I'd like to just try and say similar things but in a little bit more of a net fashion because he was so scholarly about it.

Basically, what happened was the Obama administration made a decision, which was announced Friday, that they're abandoning missile defense in Eastern Europe. Those locations are chosen because of physics and geometry to protect Western Europe and the United States from a possible launch from Iran.

Now, when you talk about missiles, it isn't too complicated. You've got little ones, medium-sized ones and great big ones. The way you stop great big ones, which we call intercontinental ballistic missiles—and they have three stages, and they go very high and very fast—is with other big, fast missiles called ground-based.

The proposal was to put defensive locations in a couple of Eastern European states, the Czech Republic, among others, and to provide ourselves with a defense. The most fundamental purpose of a civil government is to protect their citizens, particularly to protect millions of citizens in the face of somebody who says, We're going to get you. They're building weapons that can only be used for that purpose. Nuclear bombs are not used to power a power plant. They're used to blow people up.

So we have an administration which has stepped away from the fundamental purpose of any government to protect its citizens. So this is a regular head-scratcher of a decision. Not only that, but we betrayed the people who politically put their necks on the line with their constituents and with their citizens, making a controversial decision in Europe to be able to be part of this missile defense.

This was Ronald Reagan's dream, and I don't see how anybody could have trouble with the idea of trying to protect oneself against somebody who is trying to "nuke ya." I mean, to me, that just defies common sense.

So what is going on here is we've seen the Obama administration stepping away from the requirement to defend ourselves. President Bush did the heavy lifting. He went into Europe, talked to the Russians, and told them, You've got 6 months, and we're going to develop missile defense. Everybody said you can't do it. The Democrats said, It's too expensive and you can't do it. We developed the technology, and we did it.

Not only did we hit a missile with a missile, but we have demonstrated it time after time after time. At incredibly high speeds, we hit a spot on a missile with a missile. We can do that. We have the technical ability to do it and, yet, no will to follow through.

□ 2210

I don't understand that. What frightens me particularly, gentleman, is this decision is not made in a vacuum. It is a pattern that we are seeing on the Armed Services Committee and things, some of these things that from a security point of view we can hardly talk about.

But this is not one decision by itself. We are also seeing a very strong weakening of resolve in dealing with what's going on in Afghanistan. Our troops on the ground are sending us signals, hey, guys, we are going to have to go out and get it. This isn't going to be easy. This is one of these, like Iraq, it's going to be one of these insurgent-like conflicts. It is going to take some time and effort and enough people to get it. We are seeing a waffling on the part of the administration in the face of the challenges facing us in Afghanistan.

On a third point, which I would perhaps get in an argument with my very good friend from Arizona, that there is something even more upsetting to me, and that is the fact that Americans of offensive capability has been based for many decades on the idea of a triad; that is big missiles that we launch from the land, big missiles that we launch from submarines. The third leg of the triad is a bomber, a bomber that can go over some potential enemy's territory with impunity and bomb them. With that offensive capability, we can live in peace, because we have no intent of wanting to drop missiles or bombs on anybody.

But what has happened is this administration is walking away from one leg of the triad. I know my dear friend on Armed Services knows what I am talking about. I have to be careful about what I can say and not.

But this is the bomber leg. Our bombers are currently old, some of them 50 years old. It is important that we do the planning now to develop the technology and the aircraft to maintain that leg. That also is being cut by the Obama administration, and that's something that has not received hardly any public attention. But this is a big deal, as big a deal as cutting missile defense.

So this is a pattern, a pattern of not funding national defense, not

prioritizing the protection of our citizenry, and I am very uncomfortable with it.

I would like to toss those thoughts out for a little discussion.

Mr. KING of Iowa. As I listen to the descriptions that have been delivered here in ways by the three of us tonight, it takes me back to a memory that I believe 1984 was the year, if I remember correctly, that Jeane Kirkpatrick stepped down as the Ambassador to the United Nations. It wasn't a very big article. It was a little thing, about page 3 or 4, and it was in the *Des Moines Register*. I read that, and it stuck with me all that time.

I should go back and get it verbatim, but I am very close. She said we are in the middle of the cold war. If you remember, it was the height of the cold war at that time and Reagan's first term.

She said, what is going on in this cold war, this great clash of the two titan superpowers, is the equivalent of playing chess and monopoly on the same board. The only question is—remember the arms race? The only question is will the United States of America bankrupt the Soviet Union before they checkmate us militarily? Do we bankrupt the Soviet Union economically before the Soviet Union checkmates us militarily?

We know what happened as it unfolded. On November 9, 1989, 20 years coming up here in a month and a half will be the celebration of 20 years of the Berlin Wall come crashing down. That wasn't just the symbol of the Iron Curtain, that was the Iron Curtain. The Soviet Union's economy couldn't sustain this.

Well, Putin has said that's the greatest disaster of his time. Now we have watched him out on this chessboard seeking to checkmate the free world. It's very early in Putin's game, however, while he understands the monopoly game a little better, having actually built some wealth at least temporarily with the high energy prices that he has. We have watched Putin maneuver around the globe.

I would point out that the Russians went in and essentially made an offer in Kyrgyzstan that they couldn't refuse. They are in Kyrgyzstan. They cancelled the lease that we had on our airstrips that were there, which shut off our ability to be able to freight military supplies into Afghanistan. The Russians did that.

Then they had the temerity to turn to us and say, oh, never fear. We will be happy to haul that freight in for you for a price, and you can always trust us to do that in a reliable fashion. With a straight face, go in and interfere in our relations with Kyrgyzstan and make them a better offer than we are making, then turn around and say now that we have this under control, we will make sure that we will freight this equipment in, and you can trust your military operations are going to continue. That's one piece of the chessboard.

Another piece of the chessboard that Putin is playing is a little over a year ago he went in and invaded Georgia. He shut down the oil that went through Georgia. If I remember right, it's 1.2 billion barrels of oil a day that goes through Georgia on a pipeline. There is a train that hauls crude oil through Georgia. They have got natural gas pipelines that go through Georgia. The nation of Georgia is, if you are a chess player, it is the square on the chessboard that if you will notice, in a highly contested game, it almost invariably comes down to where you have a whole series of pieces that are focused on one square.

Someone will put some pressure on a square on the board, and the other—the opponent will have to put a competing piece to cover that, and then you back it up with another, another, another. That square becomes the whole game that is going to be fought out in that single square.

Georgia is the square. It's the square that energy has to go through from the energy that's on the east side of the Caspian Sea to get through Georgia to get over to the Black Sea where it can go on out and then into the shipping lanes in the rest of the world and go on around Europe and everywhere else. Natural gas and lots of it, oil, and a good supply of it, and Putin went in and controlled it. Now he has backed off a little bit, but he has said he can do whatever he wants to shut that oil off.

What do we hear from the Germans, for example? They say, well, of course a nuclear powered Iran is preferable to a military strike to take it out, as if that was an unquestionable fact. In reality, they haven't done the calculation what Mr. FRANKS calls nuclear jihad.

Additionally, the Russians shut off the fuel going through, the gas going through to Germany a year ago. It was a year ago January that happened. The Germans said, well, don't worry about that, that's only about 30 percent of our overall gas supply so it really doesn't put that much of a crimp in us. And, by the way, we have created some alternatives. We are going to build another pipeline that comes through in the north. From where? Russia, to make themselves more dependent on it.

As I watch Putin make these moves around the world and bring the resources into Iran that Mr. FRANKS has talked about, and we are naive enough, myopically naive enough to accept or even consider that there is a rational argument that somehow the President capitulated on missiles in Eastern Europe and he got a quid pro quo of some kind for it. I would pose this question beyond rhetorical: Is there anything in either one of your gentlemen's imagination that would be worth pulling the missiles out of Eastern Europe and capitulating and betraying the Poles and the Czechs and the rest of the region when they say that we have sold

them out and stabbed them in the back, sold them out to the Russians and stabbed them in the back? How could a President get a trade, a quid pro quo? What could it possibly be?

I had one of the defenders of the White House say to me, well, it would be because surely the President got something for it. Maybe he got a promise that Putin would help negotiate with Iran to slow down their nuclear development capability.

Really. It's been expanded.

Mr. AKIN. You know, that's kind of interesting, because the missile technology that Iran has gotten came from the Soviet Union. So if the Soviet Union were really serious about reducing Iran's capability, at least in the area of delivering large missiles, then they are certainly approaching it from a rather unique point of view of selling missile technology to Iran. I don't think your proposition seems to make sense.

If the President got something for giving up missile defense in Europe, it wouldn't make sense that he got something from the very country that had been giving Iran the missile-building capability.

I don't know anything that he got for that. I am not sure that maybe he didn't just do it just to be a nice guy or something. I don't see anything that he got that would be valuable enough risking our population to the population of Western Europe. So you have really caught me. I really don't know the answer to your question.

I hope the gentleman from Arizona knows what the President got.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I am looking for some imaginary response. What could the quid pro quo be? What would be worth giving up a shield, a shield against the nuclear capability of Iran, and diplomatically, economically, tactically, strategically? Does the gentleman from Arizona have any ideas?

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Well, I guess my first postulation here was that Iran, having a nuclear capability, changed everything, because it potentially worked on this coincidence of jihad and nuclear proliferation, where it empowered Iran to give nuclear weapons to terrorists. It's so hard for me to see a world like that, that I guess that's my central focus.

□ 2220

The only thing that I can put forward at all is that the President was somehow assured by Russia that that wouldn't happen if we work with Russia. But the problem is that Russia has sold us their influence about half a dozen times now—and we've gotten nothing for it.

And, secondarily, the most critical component in a nuclear program is not missile technology. Missile technology is beginning to proliferate the world over. I mean it is astonishing how much missile capability even smaller countries are beginning to have now. That mule is out of the barn, as they say.

But the fissile material or the material for making nuclear weapons is really the crux here. And Russia has delivered nuclear fuel to Iran already. So how do we somehow take their word for this situation? It's always amazing to me.

I think that Mr. Obama, in all deference to the President, is somehow ignoring the lessons of history. Where we see malevolent individuals or countries push forward to try to push back the forces of freedom, and someone blinks, as Mr. Halpern put it. Someone blinks.

There was a time when Gorbachev stared in the eyes of Ronald Reagan. And Gorbachev had to blink because Ronald Reagan didn't. He transcended hundreds of millions because Reagan had the courage to stand strong, even above the din of the liberal media in his own country.

There was a time when one of the other Russian premiers tried to stare down President John Kennedy. John Kennedy stood strong and wouldn't back up. Where would we be had that not happened?

In just recent days, Mr. Putin stared President Obama in the eye—and Mr. Obama blinked. And it has historic and grave consequences, I believe, for the free world, and especially for America and our future generations. And I am just very concerned as we go forward now that this President is going to somehow say, Well, Iran probably can have a peaceful nuclear program.

Well, let me just say to you, by the way, that Iran has so much natural gas that it would be scales of 10 cheaper for them just to produce their electricity with natural gas than to build a nuclear power plant to produce electricity. So that's a completely ridiculous notion.

But here's what I'm afraid of. I'm afraid this President is either going to naively or somehow, in the hope that he, in his broadmindedness, will convince jihad to change their mind, which they have had for hundreds of years, to change theirs—and it's just not going to happen that way.

I fear that he is going to allow Iran to go forward with a so-called peaceful nuclear program that will allow them in a very short period of time to become a nuclear weapons power in the world and translate that to not only proliferation to other rogue states, but to terrorists and, again, take us into that Samarian night when our children may have to face nuclear terrorism.

I just feel like if we let this happen now, that we're making a terrible mistake, and future generations will pay that price.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I just contemplate sometimes the naivete that can take place when you look around the globe. I remember going up to Canada and picking up some of their history books and reading the things in history from a Canadian perspective versus an American perspective. That's the first time I realized that everybody doesn't under-

stand history the same in the world. You understand it from your own perspective.

I took a legal trip down to Cuba and traveled there with a professor of Cuban history for several days, and he began to tell me about the Spanish-Cuban-American War of 1898. I never thought Cuba had anything to do with it. I thought it was the Spanish-American War. So there's a couple little snapshots.

I take you back to late February of this year, sitting in Moscow with former Prime Minister Gorbachev, who gave a lecture to me and a number of Members of Congress that he could still be ruling Russia and the Soviet Union and could have held the entire USSR together if he'd chosen to do so.

But he identified the German will for unity, and so he decided to go forward with glasnost and perestroika and open up the borders and bring about what was—let me say the “devolution” of the Soviet empire willingly. What a breathtaking view of history. He said the United States had nothing to do with it. And I'm sitting there listening to that.

He also wanted to know if there were any Republicans in the room, so he identified me right away. He accused me of going hunting with Dick Cheney.

In any case, the philosophy that the United States had nothing to do with ending the Cold War, that that clash of titans wasn't resolved in that economic and military tactical arena that Jeane Kirkpatrick talked about, but only because of the good will of Mikhail Gorbachev recognizing the desire for German unity, when you see that and you look at the European philosophy that dialogue is progress.

They came to this Capitol in September of 2003, the ambassadors to the United States from France, Germany, and Great Britain, to plead with us—wasn't quite a plea—to argue to us and try to sell us on the idea that we should open up dialogue with Iran to talk them out of a nuclear capability. At that point I said, What are you willing to do? They said, We want dialogue to open.

Okay, then what? Are you willing to go to the United Nations for resolutions, are you willing to do sanctions, are you willing to do blockades? Are you willing to lay the “or what” line out there that says if you cross this line, then we will by force resolve this issue? And if that happens, where are you going to be on that day and with what? And they just backed away from that like they had seen a ghost. Their entire mission was, dialogue was progress.

Now if we've got a viewpoint, a European viewpoint that dialogue is progress and you can always talk away your differences, that's a philosophy that doesn't fit the American viewpoint. We don't go to the Neville Chamberlain School of Diplomacy, as perhaps Obama did.

Then you have to also put into that the mindset of Putin, the Russians,

Gorbachev, the mullahs in Iran, the Islamic approach, the nuclear jihad approach. We can't measure this on the part of just simply the good will of the United States controls missiles in Iran. And I'm afraid the President has come to that conclusion—that his good will will control missiles in Iran.

The gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. AKIN. Well, I'm inclined to, as you start reminiscing that we don't learn from history, one of the things that I remember hearing about is when I was first elected to Congress in 2001, I was on the Armed Services Committee and we made the votes to fund the building of missile defense. But there was also a guy by the name of Rumsfeld who was Secretary of Defense. He came in and spoke to us on some pretty clear kinds of lines of reasoning.

He stated, If you're Secretary of Defense, there's kind of three situations. There's the things that you know about that you should worry. And those are things that are of concern to us. But the things that are particularly of concern are the things we don't know about, that we should worry. And then he gave an example of that.

One of the examples was, we had a treaty with the Soviet Union. And the treaty said that nobody is going to build biological weapons. And what had come out was in fact that the Soviet Union had all kinds of missiles pointed at America with biological weapons in those missiles, including smallpox. And so we didn't have a clue because we took their good will that they certainly wouldn't violate a treaty.

It seems to me that a more American way of thinking is if you're worried about somebody shooting a nuclear missile at you, maybe we just ought to have the capability of shooting it down before it even gets over our ground. That seems to be an awful lot more dependable mindset than trusting people who have systematically lied to us in the past.

This was a terrible decision by our administration. It can be viewed in no other light. It can only be viewed as stepping away from the responsibility of defending American citizens and Western European citizens and creating a less stable world.

This is not a decision that the American people should let stand. This is something that must be reversed. It requires action on the part of people who are patriots and people who love this country, who love life and freedom itself.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming from the gentleman from Missouri, I refer to a statement made by John Bolton, before I yield to the gentleman from Arizona. John Bolton, a former ambassador to the United Nations and a solid, very brilliant, tactical-thinking man, diplomatically tactical-thinking man.

He said that the President's decision not to deploy antiballistic missile defense is unambiguously wrong. It reflects a concession to Russian belligerence and an embarrassing abandonment of two of America's strongest allies and an appalling lack of understanding of the present and future risk posed by Iran.

□ 2230

"Worse, this unforced retreat of American hard power clearly signals what may well be a long American recession globally."

That is a chilling analysis.

I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Thank you, Mr. KING, for yielding.

I guess you said it best a moment ago when you just talked about history. Someone a long time ago said that those who don't learn from the mistakes of the past are doomed to repeat them. Someone said that the only thing we learn from history is that we don't learn from history.

But Dostoevsky said it this way: he said, He who controls the present controls the past and he who controls the past controls the future. And I think he capsulized what the liberal intelligencia have done today. They have tried to rewrite history in order to try to shape the future.

And it concerns me greatly because if you look just in a cursory glance at history, especially since the nuclear age came upon us, when we had a great enemy in the Soviet Union, they had thousands of warheads aimed at us with nuclear missiles; we had thousands aimed at them. There was almost a fearful tension there because they knew if they launched against us that we could launch against them while the missiles that they'd launched were still in the area and we would destroy each other. So we called this "mutually assured destruction," and there was a kind of a grim peace that was achieved because we put our security in their sanity and they did the same for us.

But some things have changed in history since then. First of all, terrorism has come upon us, and, second of all, nuclear proliferation has begun to make a march across the world. And now we live in a generation that sees terrorism or this jihad coming together with nuclear proliferation. And when you put those two things together, all of the historical precedents seem to fade because now you face an enemy with an ultimate capacity, whether it be just a nuclear warhead in one of our cities or launching a missile at us or even launching an EMP attack, that we haven't talked about tonight, but I hope that Members really try to learn about that. We face a situation where an enemy that has no regard for its own life, that they will be willing to kill their own children in order to kill ours, are eventually, if we continue down this path, going to find their way

to the nuclear button. And if they do and terrorists the world over gain this technology, it will change our concept of freedom forever.

I am convinced that there's nothing that Osama bin Laden and al Qaeda would like to do more than put a nuclear weapon about a hundred yards off the steps of this building and decapitate this country. And you say, well, that's an impossible scenario. It's an unthinkable scenario, but I assure you it's not impossible.

And to somehow blink and take away our capability to devalue nuclear programs in the world, as missile defense does, or to stop an incoming missile when we have to, to somehow blink in that situation is to hasten a day like that. I hope that somehow we regain our sanity in time and realize how serious the equation really is.

I appreciate so much the gentleman yielding to me tonight.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I appreciate the gentleman's coming to the floor and the background and the effort that he has put into this thing for all of these years and having emerged as one of a small handful of leaders on nuclear technology and the missile defense shield, as Mr. AKIN has as well.

I want to reiterate a statement that you made: we put our security in their sanity. That being the Russian's sanity, not the mullahs' sanity because the mullahs have a different level of rationale if you would like to call it rational at all.

Mr. Speaker, I will include in the RECORD the two articles that I addressed in my statement.

[From the Washington Times, Sept. 22, 2009]

ERRING ON THE SIDE OF INCAUTION

(By John R. Bolton)

President Obama's decision not to deploy anti-ballistic missile defense assets in Poland and the Czech Republic is unambiguously wrong. It reflects an unrequited concession to Russian belligerence, an embarrassing abandonment of two of America's strongest European allies, and an appalling lack of understanding of the present and future risks posed by Iran. Worse, this unforced retreat of American hard power clearly signals what may well be a long American recession globally.

First, Mr. Obama's capitulation was about Russia, not about Iraq. Russia has always known that former President George W. Bush's national missile defense project was not aimed against Russia's offensive nuclear capabilities, neither in scope nor in geographical deployment. To the contrary, our common interests in defending against threats from rogue states should have led to missile-defense cooperation, not antagonism.

What has really agitated Russia was not that the sites were for missile defense, but that they were an American presence in former Warsaw Pact countries, Russia's now-defunct sphere of influence.

Now, without anything resembling a quid pro quo from Moscow, Washington has dramatically reduced its presence and isolated its own friends. In Russia and Eastern Europe, the basic political conclusion is straightforward and worrying: Russia, a declining, depopulating power, growled, and the United States blinked. This devastating reaction extends worldwide, especially

among our Pacific allies, who fear similar unilateral U.S. concessions in their region.

"It is far better to err on the side of U.S. security than on the side of greater risk of nuclear devastation. There is no harm in deploying our missile defenses before Iran's ICBMs can reach America, but incalculable risk if Iran is ready before we are."

Second, Mr. Obama's proposed new missile defense deployments will not protect the United States against Iranian ICBMs, for which the Eastern European sites were primarily intended. Protecting Europe was only an ancillary, although welcome side effect, one intended to help calm European concern that the United States would abandon Europe and embrace isolationism behind national missile defenses.

Western Europe, not surprisingly, seems largely content with the Obama-projected alternative, which, if implemented, would protect Europe, but would have few tangible benefits for America.

Thus, despite Mr. Obama's rhetoric about replacing one missile defense design with a more effective one, the systems in question are aimed at two completely different objectives. Of course, it also remains to be seen whether and exactly how the administration will actually implement its projected deployment, and what new risks are entailed.

For example, U.S. ships deployed in the Black Sea would be fully exposed to Russia's naval capabilities, in contrast to more secure bases in continental Europe. Failure to implement the new plan aggressively will be seen as yet another failure of American will.

Mr. Obama's public explanation omitted any acknowledgment that the Eastern European deployments were never intended to counter existing Iranian threats, but rather were to protect against threats maturing in the future. Obviously, to be ahead of the curve and ready before Iran's threat became real, we had to begin deployment now, not in the distant future. Instead, Mr. Obama's decision effectively forecloses our ability to be ready when the real need arises.

Third, although purportedly based on new intelligence assessments about Iran's capabilities, Mr. Obama's announcement simply reflected his own longstanding biases against national missile defense. He has never believed in it strategically, or that it could ever be made operationally successful.

The new intelligence "estimate" agreeably minimizes the threat posed by Iranian ICBMs, thus facilitating a decision to cancel that had been all but made during last year's campaign. The assessment, as briefed to Congress immediately after the president's announcement, involved no actual new intelligence, but only a revised prediction of Iran's future capabilities.

The new "assessment" also confirmed the administration's often-expressed and so far frustrated desire to negotiate with Iran over Tehran's nuclear weapons program. That schedule has slipped badly, leaving Mr. Obama running out of time for diplomatic endeavors.

Moreover, stronger economic sanctions, his fallback position, are increasingly unlikely to be comprehensive or strict enough to actually stop Iran's nuclear program before completion. How convenient, therefore, to suddenly "find" more time on the missile front, thus facilitating a diplomatic strategy that had been increasingly headed toward disastrous failure. Moreover, whatever the available intelligence, it does not determine what levels of international risk we should accept. Mr. Obama has too high a tolerance for such risk.

He is too willing to place America in jeopardy of Iran's threat, a calculus exactly opposite from what we should use. It is far better to err on the side of U.S. security than on

the side of greater risk of nuclear devastation. There is no harm in deploying our missile defenses before Iran's ICBMs can reach America, but incalculable risk if Iran is ready before we are.

Mr. Obama's rationale for abandoning the Eastern European sites ignores the important reasons they were created, underestimates the Iranian threat, and bends the knee unnecessarily to Russia. This all fore-shadows a depressing future. Our president, uncomfortable with projecting American power, is following the advice of his intellectual predecessor George McGovern: "Come home, America." Both our allies and adversaries worldwide will take due note.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 23, 2009]

OBAMA AND THE POLITICS OF CONCESSION—
IRAN AND RUSSIA PUT OBAMA TO THE TEST
LAST WEEK, AND HE BLINKED TWICE
(By Mark Helprin)

During last year's campaign, Sen. Joe Biden famously remarked that, if his ticket won, it wouldn't be long before "the world tests Barack Obama like they did John Kennedy" on foreign affairs. Last week, President Obama, brilliantly wielding the powers of his office, managed to fail that test not just once but twice, buckling in the face of Russian pressure and taking a giant wooden nickel from Iran.

With both a collapsing economy and natural gas reserves sufficient to produce 270 years of electricity, the surplus of which it exports, Iran does not need nuclear electrical generation at a cost many times that of its gas-fired plants. It does, however, have every reason, according to its own lights, to seek nuclear weapons—to deter American intervention; to insure against a resurgent Iraq; to provide some offset to nearby nuclear powers Pakistan, Russia and Israel; to move toward hegemony in the Persian Gulf and address the embarrassment of a more militarily capable Saudi Arabia; to rid the Islamic world of Western domination; to neutralize Israel's nuclear capacity while simultaneously creating the opportunity to destroy it with one shot; and, pertinent to last week's events, by nuclear intimidation to turn Europe entirely against American interests in the Middle East.

Some security analysts may comfort themselves with the illusion that soon-to-be nuclear Iran is a rational actor, but no country gripped so intensely by a cult of martyrdom and death that to clear minefields it marched its own children across them can be deemed rational. Even the United States, twice employing nuclear weapons in World War II, seriously contemplated doing so again in Korea and then in Vietnam.

The West may be too pusillanimous to extirpate Iran's nuclear potential directly, but are we so far gone as to forswear a passive defense? The president would have you think not, but how is that? We will cease developing the ability to intercept, within five years, the ICBMs that in five years Iran is likely to possess, in favor of a sea-based approach suitable only to Iranian missiles that cannot from Iranian soil threaten Rome, Paris, London or Berlin. Although it may be possible for the U.S. to modify Block II Standard Missiles with Advanced Technology Kill Vehicles that could disable Iranian missiles in their boost phase, this would require the Aegis destroyers carrying them to loiter in the confined and shallow waters of the Gulf, where antimissile operations would be subject to Iranian interference and attack.

Interceptors that would effectively cover Western Europe are too big for the vertical launch cells of the Aegis ships, or even their hulls. Thus, in light of the basing difficulties

that frustrate a boost-phase kill, to protect Europe and the U.S. Mr. Obama proposes to deploy land-based missiles in Europe at some future date. If he is willing to do this, why not go ahead with the current plans? The answer is that, even if he says so, he will not deploy land-based missiles in Europe in place of the land-based missiles in Europe that he has cancelled because they are land-based in Europe.

What we have here is an inadvertent homage to Lewis Carroll: We are going to cancel a defense that takes five years to mount, because the threat will not materialize for five years. And we will not deploy land-based interceptors in Europe because our new plan is to deploy land-based interceptors in Europe.

Added to what would be the instability and potentially grave injury following upon the appearance of Iranian nuclear ICBMs are two insults that may be more consequential than the issue from which they arise. Nothing short of force will turn Iran from the acquisition of nuclear weapons, its paramount aim during 25 years of secrecy and stalling. Last fall, President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad set three conditions for the U.S.: withdrawal from Iraq, a show of respect for Iran (read "apology"), and taking the nuclear question off the table.

We are now faithfully complying, and last week, after Iran foreclosed discussion of its nuclear program and Mojtaba Samareh Hashemi, Mr. Ahmadinejad's chief political adviser, predicted "the defeat and collapse" of Western democracy, the U.S. agreed to enter talks the premise of which, incredibly, is to eliminate American nuclear weapons. Even the zombified press awoke for long enough to harry State Department spokesman P.J. Crowley, who replied that, as Iran was willing to talk, "We are going to test that proposition, OK?"

Not OK. When Neville Chamberlain returned from Munich at least he thought he had obtained something in return for his appeasement. The new American diplomacy is nothing more than a sentimental flood of unilateral concessions—not least, after some minor Putinesque sabre rattling, to Russia. Canceling the missile deployment within NATO, which Dmitry Rogozin, the Russian ambassador to that body, characterizes as "the Americans . . . simply correcting their own mistake, and we are not duty bound to pay someone for putting their own mistakes right," is to grant Russia a veto over sovereign defensive measures—exactly the opposite of American resolve during the Euro Missile Crisis of 1983, the last and definitive battle of the Cold War.

Stalin tested Truman with the Berlin Blockade, and Truman held fast. Khrushchev tested Kennedy, and in the Cuban Missile Crisis Kennedy refused to blink. In 1983, Andropov took the measure of Reagan, and, defying millions in the street (who are now the Obama base), Reagan did not blink. Last week, the Iranian president and the Russian prime minister put Mr. Obama to the test, and he blinked not once but twice. The price of such infirmity has always proven immensely high, even if, as is the custom these days, the bill has yet to come.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DOYLE of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for after noon today and for the balance of the week on account of attending the G-20 Summit in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PETERS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TOWNS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TONKO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PETERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FLEMING) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, September 30.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, September 30.

Mr. GOHMERT, for 5 minutes, today and September 24.

Mr. FLAKE, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1677. An act to reauthorize the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House reports that on September 21, 2009 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 1243. To provide for the award of a gold medal on behalf of Congress to Arnold Palmer in recognition of his service to the Nation in promoting excellence and good sportsmanship in golf.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 24, 2009, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3716. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Methoxyfenozide; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0012; FRL-8433-8] received September 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3717. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pesticide Tolerance Nomenclature Changes; Technical Amendment